Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick

Second 17/04/1990

~~Seventh~~ *Report*

of the

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON

SOCIAL POLICY DEVELOPMENT

FINAL REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF SCHOOL INTEGRATION

90-04107/

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEW BRUNSWICK
P.O. BOX 6000
FREDERICTON, N.B.
E3B 5H1

ASSEMBLEE LEGISLATIVE DU NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK
C.P. 6000
FREDERICTON, (N.-B.)
E3B 5H1

April 17, 1990

To the Honourable
The Legislative Assembly of
The Province of New Brunswick

Mr. Speaker:

Your Special Committee on Social Policy Development begs leave to submit its Final Report on the Review of School Integration for the Third Session of the Fifty-first Legislature.

This Report comprises the labour of the Committee pertaining to two documents entitled "Report of the Integration Review Committee, English Working Group" and "Report of the Francophone Advisory Committee on School Integration" which were tabled in the House on May 11, 1989 and which were subsequently referred to it on May 18, 1989 by the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick.

Your Committee was impressed with the quality and quantity of responses received via briefs and public hearings and the sincere efforts of all sides of this complex issue in attempting to find satisfactory solutions to concerns raised.

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation for the assistance provided by officials in the Department of Education in connection with various briefing sessions. It also wishes to acknowledge the service provided by the staff of the Legislative Assembly, the Clerk's Office, the Legislative Research Service and the Debates Translation. Furthermore, the Committee is grateful to the School Boards for arranging school visits and to the School Principals and Teachers for assisting with the school visitations.

The cooperation and understanding of all presenters greatly facilitated the work of the Committee.

And, your Committee asks leave to make a further report.

(Sgd.) Marilyn Trenholme

Dr. Marilyn Trenholme,
for Chairman of the Special
Committee on Social Policy
Development

Special Committee on Social Policy Development

MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Paul Duffie, M.L.A.
Chairman

Dr. Marilyn Trenholme, M.L.A.
Vice-Chairman

Mr. Danny Gay, M.L.A.

Hon. Jane Barry, M.L.A.

Mr. Jean-Paul Savoie, M.L.A.

Dr. Larry Kennedy, M.L.A.

Mr. Paul Kenny, M.L.A.

Mr. Stuart Jamieson, M.L.A.

Dr. Kal Seaman, M.L.A.

Mrs. Ann Breault, M.L.A.

Mr. Reid Hurley, M.L.A.

Mr. Allison DeLong, M.L.A.

Mr. Robert Simpson, M.L.A.

Mr. Bernard Thériault, M.L.A.

Mr. Leo McAdam, M.L.A.

Hon. Edmond Blanchard, M.L.A.

Members of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Social Policy Development Responsible for Review on School Integration

Dr. Marilyn Trenholme, Chairperson

Mrs. Ann Breault

Mr. Allison DeLong

Mr. Paul Duffie

Mr. Donald (Danny) Gay

Mr. Reid Hurley

Mr. Paul Kenny

Mr. Jean-Paul Savoie

Dr. Kal Seaman

Mr. Robert Simpson

Mr. Camille Thériault (Substitute)

Mr. Douglas Tyler (Substitute)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I 2
History of Integration in New Brunswick

CHAPTER II 6
The Work of the Committee

CHAPTER III 9
The Philosophy of Integration

CHAPTER IV 11
The Range of Exceptionalities

CHAPTER V 14
Identification and Initial Assessment

CHAPTER VI 18
Individual Education Plans (IEP)

CHAPTER VII 20
Options for Placement of Exceptional Pupils
The High School Situation 21
Placement Appeals Procedure 22

CHAPTER VIII 24
Human Resources:
Classifications, Training, Working Conditions
A. The Classroom Teacher 24
B. Teacher/Pupil Ratio or Class Size 26
C. Methods and Resource Room Teachers 27
D. Teacher's Assistant/Classroom Attendant 29
E. Other Professionals 30

CHAPTER IX 33
Funding

CHAPTER X 35
The Quality of Education

CONCLUSIONS 37

EPILOGUE 40

ANNEX

i. Terms of Reference

On May 18, 1989 the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick referred to the Special Committee on Social Policy Development the two documents tabled in the House May 11, 1989 entitled ***"Report of the Integration Review Committee, English Working Group"*** and ***"Report of the Francophone Advisory Committee on School Integration"***.

The Committee's **Terms of Reference** were as follows:

(1) Determine background of integration issues by meeting with Department of Education staff, studying legislation and the purpose of Bill 85, and reviewing research findings.

(2) Investigate integration practices by on-site visitations to schools, teachers and individual classrooms.

(3) Seek public opinion by holding hearings in representative areas of the province, starting in September.

(4) Provide a written report for the Fall sitting of the Legislature, identifying the issues and making recommendations for future directions, changes where necessary and solutions for problems.

ii. Acknowledgements

Your Committee wishes to express its appreciation for the assistance provided by officials in the Department of Education in connection with various briefing sessions. It also wishes to acknowledge the efficient and dedicated service provided by the staff of the Legislative Assembly, including the Clerk's Office, the Legislative Research Service and the Debates Translation. The Committee is immensely grateful as well to the School Boards, School Principals and Teachers for arranging school visits and providing help with the provincial tour. The cooperation and understanding of all presenters greatly facilitated the work of the Committee.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF INTEGRATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK

The public school system in New Brunswick has not always fully recognized the right of all children to education. Prior to 1957 educational services for children with mental handicaps and others with major physical disabilities such as cerebral palsy were the responsibility of their parents and by law local school boards had the right to exclude such students from the public school system.

This situation changed as a result of the Auxiliary Classes Act (1957), which gave the province a responsibility to deliver educational services to students with major disabilities. The actual services would be delivered through sponsoring groups operating under the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded. Because this latter organization was not present throughout New Brunswick, some regions were left without services for these students and as a result, the Auxiliary Classes Act was not a satisfactory solution.

In 1981 the government of the day launched a study of the Auxiliary Classes Act in the hope that all children with special needs could receive educational services. On May 29, 1982 before a meeting of the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, the Premier of the day declared that students with mental handicaps and those with special needs had the right to an education. He promised that his government would integrate these children into the regular school system.

From February to April, 1983 the Department of Education sponsored public hearings into the Auxiliary Classes Act and in September, 1983 a recommendation by the Correia-Goguen Report favoured the transfer into the Schools Act of services currently offered by the Auxiliary Classes Act.

In November of 1984 the Department of Social Services announced the closure of the Dr. William F. Roberts School in Saint John, which ceased its operation in December 1985. Children were returned to their home communities, the majority in the greater Saint John area. An effort was made to place these children in supportive educational settings commensurate with their needs and ages. Unfortunately, the rehabilitation services and interdisciplinary teams promised to the schools and communities were not made available to a sufficient degree. However, the savings which resulted from the closure of the Roberts facility were intended to provide funds as well as the initiative for agencies such as the Departments of Health, Social Services and Education to develop shared services.

On June 18, 1986 the Legislature passed Bill 85 amending the Schools Act and repealing the Auxiliary Classes Act. The Schools Act now would be the only law governing programs and services for all pupils **except for students with special education programs under the Education of Aurally or Visually Handicapped Persons Act.** The Advisory Committee to the Minister of Education under the Auxiliary Classes Act would remain intact and was asked to develop a statement of principle on school integration.

Bill 85, (an Act to Amend the Schools Act, **Interim Report**, see Annex), defines such key terms as **exceptional pupil** and **special education program** and redefines the term **school personnel**. It also outlines the process for establishing the **exceptional pupil's** status and requires that parents be consulted during this process. Each school board shall determine the **placement** of pupils in the various classes, programs, services and schools "***according to the needs of the pupils and the facilities of the district***" and with "***due regard for the educational needs of all pupils***". Ministerial guidelines may be issued to assist in this placement process.

The Act also states that the Minister must provide "***free school privileges***" to those pupils receiving **special education programs** under the **Auxiliary Classes Act**. The Minister "***may prescribe or approve***" **special education programs** for all school districts, as well as establish evaluation procedures for these programs. These could include pilot, experimental and summer school programs, services and courses. In addition, the Minister "***may prescribe or approve instructional and other materials and apparatus***" required for these **special education programs and services.**

This same Act enables school boards to budget to meet the needs of **special education programs and services.** As well, it also expands the powers of school boards to place **exceptional pupils** in various programs and services.

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council is empowered to regulate the training, certification and classification of those involved in providing **special education programs and services.** This includes the terms and conditions of employment of personnel previously employed under the **Auxiliary Classes Act** which was subsequently repealed.

A statement of principle namely *"l'Enoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire"* was published in January of 1988 by the Francophone sector of the Department of Education. The English sector of the Department published the ***"Working Guidelines on Integration"*** in March of 1988.

In the summer of 1988 the Minister of Education established an Advisory Committee for the implementation of school integration. This committee was later divided into Francophone and English sub-committees, reporting to the Minister in February, 1989.

The major recommendations of the Francophone Advisory Committee on School Integration are annexed hereto as Appendix "A" of Interim Report and the Integration Review Committee (English working group) as Appendix "B" of Interim Report.

Because of the great concerns expressed by both parents and teachers as well as other interested groups regarding the implementation of integration, the New Brunswick Legislature on May 11, 1989 referred the reports of the Integration Review Committee and of the Francophone Advisory Committee on School Integration to the Special Committee on Social Policy Development for consideration and public input.

CHAPTER II

THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

Realizing the complexity and the importance of integration to the overall education system and the need to become familiar with many of the issues, the Committee met on June 6, 1989 with the two Deputy Ministers of the Department and their support staff. At that informative session, the members learned of the broad implications of Bill 85 which amended the Schools Act. By eliminating auxiliary classes and by integrating exceptional pupils into the school system, this legislation placed New Brunswick in the forefront of this aspect of education.

Next, the twelve Committee members resolved to see for themselves how integration was working in the school system. Dividing into smaller groups, they began in June, 1989 to visit schools across the province -- a procedure that was greatly expanded when classes resumed in the fall.

The members were able to combine these on-sight visits with their public hearings, often visiting classes in the morning and conducting hearings in the afternoon and evening. Thus, they were able to talk to teachers, students and school administrators and observe the children at work, an experience that helped broaden the Committee's overall perspective for assessing the briefs and personal appearances of a broad cross-section of citizens.

The members were interested as well in the physical aspects of each school they visited -- the adaptations such as ramps -- that had been made to meet the needs of exceptional pupils and more importantly the human support services and the training required by the new program.

By the time the formal hearings had concluded in mid-October, 1989, the Committee had conducted on-site tours of 63 schools. Their public meetings took place in seven locations: Fredericton, Bathurst, Newcastle, Saint John, Moncton, Grand Falls and Woodstock.

The number of briefs submitted to the Committee indicated the complexity of the task; over 250 were submitted. This was the greatest number ever received in the history of the New Brunswick Legislature and reflected the importance with which this issue was viewed by a large cross-section of New Brunswick citizens.

Not surprisingly, the biggest group of presenters consisted of parents with school-aged children who would be termed **exceptional pupils** under the Schools Act. The same keen interest was shown by school administrators and teachers, who presented briefs on behalf of their respective groups. Another important category was represented by specific interest groups, such as the Association for Community Living, the Learning Disabilities Association, the Premier's Council on the Status of Disabled Persons and the Youth Council of New Brunswick.

Other briefs came from professional groups either directly or indirectly associated with our education system. These included the New Brunswick Medical Society, the Education Faculties at l'Université de Moncton and the University of New Brunswick, the New Brunswick Association of Social Workers, the Nurses Association of New Brunswick, and the Association of Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists.

Regardless of differing perspectives and levels of expertise, the presenters' responses before the Committee provided information and insights that proved invaluable as the members faced the daunting challenge, in the words of the **terms of reference** "***of identifying the issues and making recommendations for future directions***".

Despite the strict time constraints, the Committee was able to prepare an **Interim Report** which was presented to the Legislative Assembly on October 31, 1989. This contained several recommendations (See Annex). The Legislature complied with the Committee's request to continue their deliberations and to prepare a more detailed final report.

CHAPTER III

THE PHILOSOPHY OF INTEGRATION

The basic change in philosophy represented by the passage of Bill 85 is the assumption that all students should be included in the school system. Any move to exclude a student has to be justified. In contrast, the previous Act had the reverse implication: inclusiveness had to be justified.

A school administrator observed that the broad issue of integration ***"is a matter of committing ourselves to the process of change and creating a sense of community out of accepted differences"***. A parent urged educators at all levels to look at children ***"for their abilities and not their disabilities"*** when they enter the school system.

A belief that the concept of integration was already starting to take hold, only three years after the passage of Bill 85, was expressed by a school trustee. He felt that as a result of the new education policy, students were learning acceptance, tolerance and a sense of responsibility that would make them better citizens.

Another group warned that when people are treated as less than full citizens, for whatever reason -- race, religion, gender, language or physical handicap -- they risk being dehumanized. ***"In caring communities, segregation has no validity; not in living places; not in workplaces; not in schools"***.

Many presenters noted students' varying gifts and abilities and urged educators to continue to stimulate all students, whether they be those with superior academic ability, the average student, or those having special needs. Frequently this observation was made about exceptional children: society must acknowledge that it is dealing with students who can learn, but must learn differently.

Regardless of differing views and perspectives, there seemed to be a general concensus among the many briefs that the new philosophy implicit in Bill 85 is being accepted by the key players in the education system, whether they be teachers, administrators, parents or students. Where they sometimes differed was in the best ways to implement this philosophy.

CHAPTER IV

THE RANGE OF EXCEPTIONALITIES

A close examination of section 1.1 of the Schools Act defining the term *"exceptional pupil"* reveals the breadth of its intent. It states:

> ***Where qualified persons employed by or acting as agents of a school board determine that the behavioural, communicational, intellectual, physical, perceptual or multiple exceptionalities of a person are such that a special education program is considered by them to be necessary for the person, that person shall be an exceptional pupil for the purposes of this Act.***

When a pupil has been designated as **exceptional**, an Individual Education Plan [IEP] is required for that child.

The problem of interpreting section 1.1 of the Schools Act is reflected in the concerns expressed by many presenters that the limited resources -- financial, human and physical -- are being applied to those pupils whose exceptionalities are more obvious. Many observed that other students with special needs, such as the gifted, the learning disabled, the slow learners, those with attention disorders, have not always been identified as **exceptional** and therefore have not benefitted from special materials, supplies or extra help from the methods and resource teachers, or other paraprofessionals.

As was pointed out several times during the hearings, the confusion arose from the earlier use of the term "exceptional" when it commonly referred to gifted and talented students. Many presenters stated that, under the new Act, gifted students should have greater access to their own special programs.

One group of students frequently identified by presenters were the **learning disabled**. The Canadian Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities said the term refers to those ***"who may experience difficulty in the areas of memory, attention, reasoning, reading, writing, spelling, calculations, social competence and emotional maturation"***. These students often are able to compensate so that they may appear to be overcoming their problems, and for this reason do not usually receive IEPs which could be of great benefit. According to one presenter, ***"children with learning disabilities have always been present in the school system, but due to insufficient awareness among professionals and parents, these children have been misunderstood, mislabled and misdirected"***. The New Brunswick Medical Society estimated that 3,000 children in the province are learning disabled, but only 958 have been identified.

Several presenters recommended that section 1.1 of the new Act be revised so that the definition of **exceptional pupils** is much more specific. For example, the term **behavioural** mentioned in this section is not defined. For those who must deal with this issue, namely the teachers, it refers to those pupils who cause disruptions in the classroom. To put it in the vernacular, they ***"act up"*** and often are removed temporarily from the regular classroom, to use the phrasing of section 45(2.1) of the Act, with ***"due regard for the educational needs of all pupils"*** and, by implication, in the best interests of the child in question. A number of presenters pointed out that class disruptions were often caused by students with behavioural problems and less often by exceptional students.

According to one brief, a student who not only behaves in a socially unacceptable manner but also endangers the climate of the classroom can create serious problems and might even endanger the safety of other students and the teacher.

Committee's Responses

While supporting the intentions of section 1.1 of the Act, the Committee members were made aware early in the hearings of the problems educators and others were having in interpretating this section. Also, full attention has not been given to all categories listed under the Act. The challenge remains to fully define these exceptionalities.

The Committee notes there was general agreement among the presenters about the **intent** of section 1.1 and agrees with the view that the Department must ensure that there is a common understanding of this **intent** so that its application is applied as uniformly as possible. Furthermore, programs should be made available to cover all exceptionalities so that each student has access to a special education program where this is necessary.

Recommendations

--that the range of exceptionalities be clarified further in terms of definition and inclusiveness and that the issue of gifted students be addressed;

--that the department consult with the various players in the educational system to develop a strategy aimed at addressing the behavioural problems in the schools.

CHAPTER V

IDENTIFICATION AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT

Constantly throughout the hearings, the Committee noted the great concern as well as the wide range of opinions regarding this complex issue of identification and assessment. Some presenters questioned the need for any initial assessment on the grounds that this led to labelling. Others were equally adamant that assessment was essential before any special education program could be established for an exceptional student.

For the vast majority of New Brunswick children, the first assessment is a broad screening process prior to school registration to establish the child's general readiness to receive formal education. It is quite clear that school authorities must have parental approval before conducting a more particular assessment to determine the necessity of a special education program.

On the first day of the public hearings, a university specialist was asked how early assessment should take place. Noting that the principles of early childhood education were ***"built into Bill 85"***, he said that it was not a school question but ***"a very broad"*** one of education. Learning disabled children, for example, were not identified until they started school, and for this reason ***"school seems to be the best assessment tool initially"***. His ***"earlier the better"*** approach for assessment was endorsed repeatedly during the hearings by many who recognized the need for early intervention.

A pilot program at the University of New Brunswick, the first of its kind in Canada, worked with three exceptional children, one only nine months old, to prepare them for the challenge of integrating them into a day-care system. According to the parent of one of these children, this project on infant stimulation influenced **early intervention** programs.

Some thought that undue attention to assessment could overshadow the emphasis on the child. In the words of one district supervisor in charge of student services, "***assessments are fine, but a good teacher with good observation skills... can tell you the same information that you get from many assessments***".

This view was strongly endorsed by the parents of an exceptional pupil who thrived after being integrated. They wanted less time and money spent on assessment and more to support local school boards "***through on-going assessments and program development carried out by people who know the student best***".

Another presenter, while favouring continual assessments, strongly objected to "***the kind of pre-school testing***" done to determine the class, school or district a child would attend. She saw this as a rationale for exclusion.

Clearly, no consensus on this major issue emerged from the hours of testimony and scores of briefs. It was difficult to find agreement **when** it should be done and how the information should be used to best help the child. One presenter thought part of the problem stemmed from the lack of a standardized assessment technique. Many pointed to the difficulties both to the child and parents arising from **labelling** -- a practice that in the past was often required before schools could receive funding and services. As one presenter observed, "***society has dictated what our children can or cannot do and has set limitations on their abilities. We are trying to change the labels... but we require support from***

our schools and our communities to achieve our goals".

Some communities have benefitted from the establishment of Early Intervention Programs to provide services for children who have exhibited delays in their development. Several presenters said that early intervention programs can make a significant difference in the development of exceptional children; they felt that this approach could be more beneficial than later remedial efforts.

Committee's Responses

The Committee agrees with the present pre-school screening system, which is a simple process to determine the child's readiness for school. By **screening**, the Committee is referring to the broad testing process aimed at identifying the child's general strengths and needs. It should not be confused with **assessing**, which calls for a greater degree of evaluation of the level of the child's mental and physical abilities.

The Committee believes that assessment should not be used to label a student. Rather, it should be a fundamental **ongoing process** to establish whatever modifications may be required to further the child's educational program, including an Individual Education Plan if required.

The Committee strongly supports the view frequently expressed in the hearings that the assessment process at all times must have the full cooperation of all key players, including parents as well as the classroom teacher.

Recommendations

-- *that the child's placement in the regular classroom should not be delayed by assessment procedures and ministerial directives should reflect this view.*

-- *that the Minister of State for Childhood Services, in consultation with the Minister of Education, establish as a priority Early Intervention Programs for all pre-school children exhibiting any potential learning or health problems and that the Department of Health and Community Services participate in the funding of such programs.*

-- *that community volunteers be encouraged to participate in Early Intervention Programs and community-based models be considered to the fullest extent.*

CHAPTER VI

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLANS (IEP)

Perhaps no other aspect reflects a new approach to public education in New Brunswick more than the **Individual Education Plan.** As defined by the Schools Act, it is a special education program "***based on the results of continuous assessment and evaluation and which includes a plan containing specific objectives and recommendations for education services that meets the needs of the exceptional pupil***".

There was widespread agreement that such programs should ***be directed at*** the pupil's strengths rather than weaknesses. Furthermore, there should be improved follow-up services, especially for students with learning disabilities. Each experience must establish the objectives and the means of achieving them. As well, there should be periodic evaluations to monitor the effectiveness of any intervention.

Many presenters favoured a **team approach** for finding the most suitable IEP for each child and suggested that where possible the student should also be involved. They felt that that team should include, from the beginning, the classroom teacher, the Methods and Resource Room teacher, other consultants and parents.

Committee's Responses

An overview of the briefs and the views expressed by the many presenters indicates a general acceptance of the principle of Individual Education Plans. The concerns raised on this topic were directed at the need for support services and special education materials to implement the IEP. The Committee shares this view.

CHAPTER VII

OPTIONS FOR PLACEMENT OF EXCEPTIONAL PUPILS

The Act is explicit about the responsibility for placement of all pupils in the school system. It rests with the local school board. Section 45(2.1) says that special education programs and services should be provided "***within regular classroom settings to the extent that is considered practicable by the Board having due regard for the educational needs of all pupils***". As was noted in the Committee's **Interim Report**, differences in interpreting and implementing the Act need to be reconciled.

There was a great deal of comment in the briefs and from the presenters on this overall issue of placement. Models presently in use range from complete integration in a regular classroom to partial or complete exclusion. There was minimal support, both among parents and educators, for segregated classes. In the words of one presenter, "***we must acknowledge that the regular classroom is not the ideal learning environment for all children***". Nevertheless, placement should provide the opportunity to participate and contribute "***according to the child's strengths and needs***".

An administrator warned against working from the premise that any child could be automatically segregated and would have to earn the right to get into the regular classroom. In effect, he expressed the view of many presenters when he opposed the policy of assessment **before** placement. They would place all the children in a regular classroom first and would deal with exceptionalities as they arose.

Most presenters acknowledged the need for exceptional students to receive some instruction in a separate **resource room.** Concern was expressed about the future of the **resource room** if the policy of taking the support services into the regular classroom was fully implemented. [This important issue is discussed in more detail later in the **Report.**]

The High School Situation

The overwhelming emphasis with respect to assessment and placement was on the elementary school level, but a few singled out what they perceived as the special high school situation. One group observed that the secondary school teacher was a **subject** specialist responsible for providing a large number of students with information, concepts and skills related to a particular subject area as well as to career goals. Presenters thought the high school curriculum should provide more work study programs where some individuals go out into the community work-force to gain necessary skills.

These presenters also expressed concern over the present curriculum focus aimed at special needs students. ***"A lot of emphasis is placed on keeping people happy"***. The programs do not promote life skills or the skills needed to earn a living. At the present time, the only criterion determining when a special needs student will leave school is chronological age.

Several recognized that exceptional students leaving the school system often are not ready to enter the work-force and must further their education. To address this transition period, they recommended that strategies be developed permitting entry into appropriate community college courses. Another suggested alternative was to liaise with officials at Canada Employment and Immigration so that special programs could be better utilized.

Placement Appeals Procedure

Many commented on the sharp increase in challenges across the country regarding the placement of exceptional children and urged that an equitable appeal procedure be established in New Brunswick. The following options were presented: third party mediation, a tribunal, an arbitration board, or a process established in law and made easily accessible, especially to parents.

While agreeing with having the right to appeal, one parent group thought this could be accomplished without using the courts. Several briefs objected to a procedure which allowed judges to overule school board decisions dealing with placement disputes.

One alternative would be to establish an appeal procedure in each school district to ensure that the settlements are in the child's best interests. Another brief recommended that the school board, supported by a team of professionals at the district level, be vested with final authority for placement so long as there was a review process that was incorporated in the Schools Act.

Yet another suggestion was to establish an arbitration board similar to those already in place under the Arbitration Act. Many felt that parents should not be responsibile for legal costs. Considerable concern was expressed for the cost and the length of time involved in the existing appeals procedure.

Committee's Responses

The Committee realizes that the placement procedure lies at the heart of the integration policy. The members believe that each student has the right to have a regular, **age-appropriate** classroom as a home-room. The time spent outside the regular classroom will depend on the child's needs from day-to-day and on the **Individual Education Plan** for that child.

The Committee firmly believes that other educational settings -- be they resource rooms in the school, at home or other facilities in the community -- should be selected for exceptional students only for compelling reasons and for the shortest time possible. There should always be the objective to return the child to the regular classroom setting.

The Committee agrees with the view that the high school level presents a different set of challenges requiring different approaches regarding placement. These could include work experience, life skills programs and community involvement. Beyond this, the government must address the need for ongoing integration into the community.

The Committee reaffirms that local school boards should have the authority over programs and the placement of children.

Recommendation

-- that the Minister of Education establish an effective appeals process to be used whenever parents, and/or students are not satisfied with the placement or educational program decisions made by school boards.

CHAPTER VIII

HUMAN RESOURCES: CLASSIFICATIONS, TRAINING, WORKING CONDITIONS

The key component for a successful integration program is the **teacher.** As many briefs indicated, New Brunswick's public school system is fortunate in having a corps of professional teachers committed to dealing with the exceptional pupil. Many briefs and presenters acknowledged the need for the classroom person to gain more specific training through formal courses of instruction and in-service programs. It must be recognized that the system includes regular classroom teachers, resource room teachers, substitute teachers, plus assistants known as teacher's aides and classroom attendants. In addition, integration depends on the services of other professionals such as speech language pathologists, public health nurses, psychologists, social workers, physiotherapists -- to mention only a few.

In view of the fact that several groups requested definitions for these various categories of **human resources,** this report will deal separately with each of the main groups.

A. The Classroom Teacher

Many presenters -- including professional educators as well as parents and other concerned citizens -- acknowledged the gap in the training of many teachers to deal with the new challenges posed by the integrated classroom. They felt that this training should take place **before** the teacher deals with exceptional pupils and their individualized

education programs. Despite this, the most frequent suggestion was a provision enabling the teachers to take in-service training during the regular school day. As well, presenters urged that extra training be made available during the summer months with incentives for teachers to attend and upgrade themselves at universities which must in turn be encouraged to offer special education courses. A number of briefs urged that these courses be made mandatory for all those entering the teaching profession.

Committee's Responses

Among the comments heard by the Committee on this vital need for a well-trained corps of teachers were those that declared that no matter what model of integration one chooses, it would work only if it has teachers with adequate training and experience in teaching exceptional pupils and is backed up by the necessary support services. The Committee, in its **Interim Report**, recognized the importance of training when it recommended immediate consultation among those directly involved in assisting New Brunswick teachers to better provide for the needs of exceptional students. These agencies include the departments of Education and Advanced Education and Training as well as the institutions of post-secondary education, local school boards and the two provincial teachers' associations.

Since the Committee Members learned so much about integration from school visits, it is hoped that emphasis will be placed on more inter-district visits by principals and teachers.

Recommendations

-- that the Minister of Education continue to address the need for increased professional development for teachers through in-service programs focusing on exceptional students and that this be primarily at the local level.

-- that teacher-training institutions in New Brunswick commit themselves to increasing the programs dealing with the teaching of exceptional students and that these programs be made mandatory for the certification of all teachers.

B. Teacher/Pupil Ratio or Class Size

Another major issue raised by presenters was the **teacher/pupil ratio**, or class size. Many felt that class size must be reduced in relation to specific exceptionalities. It was recommended that the size of integrated classes be determined by the number and the degree of exceptionality of integrated students. Several presenters were in favour of limiting exceptional pupils to **one** per class, even though it was admitted this was the ideal which might not be practical in some situations.

Recommendation

-- that the number and type of exceptionalities in a classroom be a factor in determining the total number of students in that class.

C. Methods and Resource Room Teachers

The Methods and Resource Room teachers, in some cases, had formerly been involved with auxiliary classes in the era before Bill 85. Since integration, this teacher's role has been to assist the classroom teacher in adapting the regular program and teaching methods to meet the needs of exceptional pupils. After consulting with the child's home-room teacher and the parents and other resource personnel, the Methods and Resource Room Teacher identifies the necessary support services and helps prepare an individualized education plan.

Some presenters felt that ideally the Methods and Resource Room Teacher should have classroom teaching experience. Due to the heavy responsibilities involved, several briefs urged that this resource teacher **not** carry a regular teaching assignment.

It was felt that a **resource room** should be maintained by a methods and resource teacher. It was observed that since a regular classroom teacher must divide his/her time among slow learners, as well as children with behavioural problems, the additional responsibility of exceptional pupils makes the resource room even more necessary, especially when special services cannot be delivered in the regular classroom setting.

Despite this, a number of parents expressed concern that the resource room was being used so extensively that it was becoming a euphemism for a segregated class.

Committee's Responses

The Committee's perception of this aspect of the integration program was greatly enhanced by on-site visits made to many school facilities. As a result of this practical experience, the members strongly endorse the many views expressed as to the importance of the resource room in the overall education program. The Committee wishes to see such facilities developed to their fullest potential in each school in order to serve all students. Stated another way, the resource room must be viewed as a centre for consultation and planning covering the whole range of exceptionalities.

The Committee shares the concern that the resource room might be used as a **de facto** facility to isolate exceptional pupils and thus thwart the concept and goals of integration. It is crucial that the resource room's facilities be used to prepare the pupils to return to the regular classroom as soon as possible.

Recommendations

-- that the resource room be used to its fullest potential for specific periods of time, for specific purposes or special projects unavailable in the regular classroom, to better serve the needs of the individual student;

-- that the resources and methods teacher(s) be made available to every teacher serving exceptional students as defined under the Schools Act.

D. Teacher's Assistant/Classroom Attendant

These two categories have one thing in common: their roles and qualifications are not defined in the Schools Act. According to the briefs and comments presented to the Committee, each has a distinct role. The **teacher's aide** or **assistant**, as the term suggests, acts as a helper for the teacher and actively participates in the individualized program of the exceptional student. The **classroom attendant**, on the other hand, helps in the physical care of the exceptional student.

There was a strong plea from a significant number of briefs for the Department of Education to define the roles of these two support groups and to provide regulations describing their duties and the minimum qualifications required. Many presenters who addressed this issue recommended that Community Colleges establish the prescribed training programs both for teachers' aides and classroom attendants. Nevertheless, this should not preclude using well-qualified persons already available in the community, so long as adequate in-service training is provided.

Committee's Responses

The Committee was gratified to learn from many presenters of the great improvement made in this category of support personnel but agrees that much remains to be done, especially in terms of training. Its members agree that the different roles of the teachers' aides and classroom attendants should be defined so as to make best use of these two categories. It is assumed that this support group always works under the direct supervision of classroom teachers in consultation with paraprofessionals.

Recommendations

--that, under Sec. 72(f)(ii) of the Schools Act, the Department of Education define the role and qualification requirements of the support groups (teachers'aides, classroom attendants) and that training and certification should take place prior to any placement in the classroom.

E. **Other Professionals**

Many presenters noted that the successful integration of exceptional students requires the coordinated effort of a team of educators and support of para-professionals. Yet, not only New Brunswick but the entire nation is faced with a marked shortage of these specialists. This situation was stressed repeatedly throughout the hearings by all those directly involved in our education system. Two groups in particular have had a close association with school children.

1. **Speech-Language pathologists** -- The need for speech-language pathologists in the school system has been well established. The lack of an adequate number of these specialists represents a very serious deficiency; nine of this group are employed by school districts, including two part-time; another six work under the Department of Health and Community Services. In addition, about 75 work in private practice or in association with local hospitals.

2. **Public health nurses** -- They were concerned that their role in school integration was not receiving sufficient attention. Serving to underscore this point, they noted a lack of guidelines ***"for the delivery of nursing services in the school system"*** and the fact that auxiliary

personnel rather than school nurses often delivered health services. Where auxiliary personnel are part of the school health team, they urged that a nurse supervise the service. At the same time, school boards and teachers referred frequently to their need for greater accessibility to the public health nurse. Since exceptional students often include those who may require medication which can produce side effects, these situations make the availability of nurses in the school essential.

Another issue affecting all professionals involved with the education system was **jurisdiction.** Should school boards hire professionals like public health nurses or speech-language pathologists or should this be the responsibility of the Department of Health and Community Services? Several mentioned the importance of the **team approach** within the school setting. In particular, speech-language pathologists stated that they preferred to be employed directly by school boards, a view supported by their national association.

Committee's Responses

The views expressed by supporting professionals underscored the changes society has undergone in recent times, especially as these changes affect children. To cite an example, a generation ago, a sick child was sent home; now, in this age of latch-key children, this is not always possible. The school has been described as the ultimate social agency and ideally must have access to ancillary medical and social services.

The Committee was made aware of the staffing shortages among professions providing the integrated school's support services.

Recommendations

-- that immediate action be taken to resolve the serious shortages of professionals such as public health nurses, speech-language pathologists and other key players required to ensure the success of the public school system;

-- that the Department of Education, in concert with the Department of Health and Community Services, develop guidelines for nursing services in the public school system;

-- that the need for speech-language pathologist services for the schools be given priority.

CHAPTER IX

FUNDING

As was noted in the Committee's **Interim Report**, there was a universal call for more funds to implement integration. Unfortunately, similar unanimity was lacking on the question of how increased funds should be spent. This was not surprising considering the difficulty in assessing the true financial needs of integration. One school board brief urged that funding be increased annually ***"for the foreseeable future"*** to meet the needs of exceptional students. Others recommended that annual budgets be revised during the year ***"as the needs arise"*** in each school district.

A number of presenters would like to see guidelines covering the disbursement of funds earmarked for the needs of exceptional pupils. Concern was expressed that a situation was developing wherein integration's funding requirements were competing with those of the overall school budget.

Committee's Responses

The issue of funding was one of the most discussed topics of the entire hearings. Most presenters recognized the need for more funding for integration but few could make any suggestions regarding the specific amount required. The Committee acknowledges this problem but believes that funding for integration should be treated in the same manner as other aspects of education -- that is, in the ordinary budgetary process for each school district.

The Committee wishes to emphasize that many of the responses and recommendations outlined in this report to make integration work better --such as increasing the number of para-professionals, providing resource rooms, increasing the numbers of teacher's aides and classroom attendants and providing more teacher training and in-service --will require large amounts of money on an annual, ongoing basis. Each year, the budget of this province must reflect these needs. The Committee urges the Minister to take the necessary steps to safeguard the resources required to meet the needs of all exceptional students.

Recommendations

-- that each year, the budget of this province reflect the funding requirements to meet the mandate of Bill 85.

CHAPTER X

THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

The general aim of any public education system traditionally has been to develop each child's academic potential. In the past -- **before** the passage of the present Schools Act -- the emphasis was on that mythical **regular** student and the main thrust of the programs was so directed. Everyone closely associated with a child's development -- be they parents, teachers, administrators--realize there is no easy nor royal road to learning. Each child must proceed at his/her own pace and according to his/her abilities. Significant amendments to the present Schools Act have led to individualized programs for exceptional students which facilitated the implementation of integration.

Have the amendments contained in Bill 85 **lowered** the quality of education in New Brunswick's public school system? This question was frequently asked during the hearings and while some specific concerns were voiced, other presenters were strong in their conviction that the school system had turned a corner, for the better.

Several briefs called for a balance in the system's human, physical and financial resources so that all students would benefit to the fullest extent. Fear was expressed that the educational focus might be moving away from the so-called average student to centre on the exceptional student.

Conversely, other briefs clearly suggested that the quality of education had improved rather than diminished. Student achievements were not adversely affected and what was equally important, they were learning "***acceptance, tolerance and a sense of responsibility***" that would make them better citizens. The Committee was informed that a new generation was emerging that had fewer prejudices.

Committee's Responses

The Committee recognizes, through this examination process and their school visits, that integration involves other specialists needed for the delivery of more elaborate and individualized education programs. When a full complement of these human and other resources is available, the quality of our education system should not be diminished but should benefit all students, including those with exceptionalities.

CONCLUSIONS

The Committee members have been challenged and rewarded by the opportunity and privilege to examine school integration in New Brunswick. We have shared the lives of children and their parents; we have met young people who are a testimony to the success of integration just as we have come to know of other children who have not benefitted from the successful implementation of integration. We have sought to comprehend the impact of Bill 85 on students, teachers and school boards. All of this has enabled us to better understand the struggles of exceptional students to have a meaningful place in New Brunswick's educational system.

We appreciate the support and contributions of many community and professional groups. We have had the full cooperation of officials in the Department of Education to provide factual briefings and of the research staff of the Legislature to coordinate our work. Our presentation is the product of our experiences and the study we have undertaken to interpret Bill 85 as our province enters the 1990s.

Our task has revealed to us that the integration of **all** exceptional children into the regular school system cannot happen easily but only with a combination of goodwill, effort, time and money. We are confident that integration can succeed in every school district and that every exceptional child will have the opportunity to share educational and social experiences with other children in our schools. We trust that our province will strive to be an example of tolerance and fairness to all of Canada in the integration of exceptional children in our schools.

This report is a reflection of our effort to produce a synthesis of information from the massive volume of material presented to us. There are many areas, such as early intervention, assessment, the development of individual education plans and the provision of resource rooms and materials which will demand the ongoing commitment of educators at all levels in order to attain ever-improving educational environments and methods in our schools. We anticipate that the Government in New Brunswick will continue to emphasize the importance of early childhood intervention and education to lessen many of the problems faced by students, teachers and parents.

For integration to succeed, teachers must feel that they have the cooperation of all departments concerned, the full support of the government of New Brunswick and the assurance of adequate materials and support staff in the classroom. They need to be full partners in the decision-making process concerning the programs for exceptional children. All elements of our society should become more sensitive to the stress which teachers experience in today's classrooms and do all that is feasible to alleviate their burden. The government must ensure that a major effort is made to attract more members of professional groups required to make integration work; speech-language pathologists, pyschologists, social workers, public health nurses and others. In addition, an untiring effort must continue not only to hire those persons but to ensure that a proper amount of their time is devoted to the school system. It is clear that a greater measure of cooperation and communication must develop at all levels -- departments of government, school districts as well as among teachers and parents.

Parents have told this Committee in the most eloquent and impassioned words how much integration means to them and their families. Bill 85 provides for their full participation. Since integration is an ongoing process, parents of every exceptional child have the right to see more integration and a more meaningful educational experience in our province for the students identified in Bill 85.

Already, New Brunswick has a treasure of success stories about integration. The Committee marvelled at the skills mastered, the disabilities conquered and the human growth achieved by children in every part of this province. Beyond this, we recognize the impact of integration on every student and every person in the system. Values such as sharing, equality and individual worth all assume a greater meaning in a school where integration flourishes. The implications for our society are obvious.

To guard against any erosion in the academic standards of our schools, it is imperative that educators at all levels continuously monitor the achievements of **all** students. The future of our youth and of our province depends to a large extent on the excellence of our education system. We can accept nothing less.

EPILOGUE

This Committee's study into integration provided its members with a window to view the entire public school system and we saw far more than we ever anticipated. Our tour of the schools of this province made it abundantly clear that the system's ability to meet the ever-growing demands placed upon it is being seriously challenged. We cannot continue to patch up or make changes on a number of educational initiatives.

We recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission with a broad mandate to examine our present education system in order to help it prepare for what surely is a new age.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Range of Exceptionalities

Responses

While supporting the intentions of section 1.1 of the Act, the Committee members were made aware early in the hearings of the problems educators and others were having in interpretating this section. Also, full attention has not been given to all categories listed under the Act. The challenge remains to fully define these exceptionalities.

The Committee notes there was general agreement among the presenters about the intent of section 1.1 and agrees with the view that the Department must ensure that there is a common understanding of this intent so that its application is applied as uniformly as possible. Furthermore, programs should be made available to cover all exceptionalities so that each student has access to a special education program where this is necessary.

Recommendations

-- That the range of exceptionalities be clarified further in terms of definition and inclusiveness and that the issue of gifted students be addressed;

-- That the Department consult with the various players in the educational system to develop a strategy aimed at addressing the behavioural problems in the schools.

Identification and Initial Assessment

Responses

The Committee agrees with the present pre-school screening system, which is a simple process to determine the child's readiness for school. By screening, the Committee is referring to the broad testing process aimed at identifying the child's general strengths and needs. It should not be confused with assessing, which calls for a greater degree of evaluation of the level of the child's mental and physical abilities.

The Committee believes that assessment should not be used to label a student. Rather, it should be a fundamental ongoing process to establish whatever modifications may be required to further the child's educational program, including an Individual Education Plan if required.

The Committee strongly supports the view frequently expressed in the hearings that the assessment process at all times must have the full cooperation of all key players, including parents as well as the classroom teacher.

Recommendations

-- That the child's placement in the regular classroom should not be delayed by assessment procedures and ministerial directives should reflect this view.

-- That the Minister of State for Childhood Services, in consultation with the Minister of Education, establish as a priority Early Intervention Programs for all pre-school children exhibiting any potential learning or health problems and that the Department of Health and Community Services participate in the funding of such programs.

-- That community volunteers be encouraged to participate in Early Intervention Programs and community-based models be considered to the fullest extent.

Individual Education Plans

Response

An overview of the briefs and the views expressed by the many presenters indicates a general acceptance of the principle of Individual Education Plans. The concerns raised on this topic were directed at the need for support services and special education materials to implement the IEP. The Committee shares this view.

Placement

Responses

The Committee realizes that the placement procedure lies at the heart of the integration policy. The members believe that each student has the right to have a regular, age-appropriate classroom as a home-room. The time spent outside the regular classroom will depend on the child's needs from day-to-day and on the Individual Education Plan for that child.

The Committee firmly believes that other educational settings -- be they resource rooms in the school, at home or other facilities in the community -- should be selected for exceptional students only for compelling reasons and for the shortest time possible. There should always be the objective to return the child to the regular classroom setting.

The Committee agrees with the view that the high school level presents a different set of challenges requiring different approaches regarding placement. These could include work experience, life skills programs and community involvement.

The Committee reaffirms that local school boards should have the authority over programs and the placement of children.

Recommendation

-- That the Minister of Education establish an effective appeals process to be used whenever parents, and/or students are not satisfied with the placement or educational program decisions made by school boards.

Classroom Teacher

Response

Among the comments heard by the Committee on this vital need for a well-trained corps of teachers were those that declared that no matter what model of integration one chooses, it would work only if it has teachers with adequate training and experience in teaching exceptional pupils and it is backed up by the necessary support services. The Committee, in its Interim Report, recognized the importance of training when it recommended immediate consultation among those directly involved in assisting New Brunswick teachers to better provide for the needs of exceptional students. These agencies include the departments of Education and Advanced Education and Training as well as the institutions of post-secondary education, local school boards and the two provincial teachers' associations.

Recommendations

-- That the Minister of Education continue to address the need for increased professional development for teachers through in-service programs focussing on exceptional students and that this be primarily at the local level.

-- That teacher-training institutions in New Brunswick commit themselves to increasing the programs dealing with the teaching of exceptional students and that these programs be made mandatory for the certification of all teachers.

Class Size

Recommendation

-- That the number and type of exceptionalities in a classroom be a factor in determining the total number of students in that class.

Methods and Resource Room Teacher

Responses

The Committee's perception of this aspect of the integration program was greatly enhanced by on-site visits made to many school facilities. As a result of this practical experience, the members strongly endorse the many views expressed as to the importance of the resource room in the overall education program. The Committee wishes to see such facilities developed to their fullest potential in each school in order to serve all students. Stated another way, the resource room must be viewed as a centre for consultation and planning covering the whole range of exceptionalities.

The Committee shares the concern that the resource room might be used as a de facto facility to isolate exceptional pupils and thus thwart the concept and goals of integration. It is crucial that the resource room's facilities be used to prepare the pupils to return to the regular classroom as soon as possible.

Recommendations

-- ***That the resource room be used to its fullest potential for specific periods of time, for specific purposes or special projects unavailable in the regular classroom, to better serve the needs of the individual student;***

-- ***That the resources and methods teacher(s) be made available to every teacher serving exceptional students as defined under the Schools Act.***

Teacher's Assistant/Classroom Attendant

Response

The Committee was gratified to learn from many presenters of the great improvement made in this category of support personnel but agrees that much remains to be done, especially in terms of training. Its members agree that the different roles of the teachers' aides and classroom attendants should be defined so as to make best use of these two categories. It is assumed that this support group always works under the direct supervision of classroom teachers in consultation with paraprofessionals.

Recommendation

-- ***That, under Sec 72(f)(ii) of the Schools Act, the Department of Education define the role and qualification requirements of the support groups (teachers' aides, classroom attendants) and that this training and certification should take place prior to any placement in the classroom.***

Other Professionals

Responses

The views expressed by supporting professionals underscored the changes society has undergone in recent times, especially as these changes affect children. To site an example, a generation ago, a sick child was sent home; now, in this age of latch-key children, this is not always possible. The school has been described as the ultimate social agency and ideally must have access to ancillary medical and social services.

The Committee was made aware of the staffing shortages among professions providing the integrated school's support services.

Recommendations

-- That immediate action be taken to resolve the serious shortages of professionals such as public health nurses, speech-language pathologists and other key players required to ensure the success of the public school system;

-- That the Department of Education, in concert with the Department of Health and Community Services, develop guidelines for nursing services in the public school system;

-- That the need for speech-language pathologist services for the schools be given priority.

Funding

Responses

The issue of funding was one of the most discussed topics of the entire hearings. Most presenters recognized the need for more funding for integration but few could make any suggestions regarding the specific amount required. The Committee acknowledges this problem but believes that funding for integration should be treated in the same manner as other aspects of education -- that is, in the ordinary budgetary process for each school district.

The Committee wishes to emphasize that many of the responses and recommendations outlined in this report to make integration work better -- such as increasing the number of para-professionals, providing resource rooms, increasing the numbers of teacher's aides and classroom attendants and providing more teacher training and in-service -- will require large amounts of money on an annual, ongoing basis. Each year, the budget of this province must reflect these needs. The Committee urges the Minister to take the necessary steps to safeguard the resources required to meet the needs of all exceptional students.

Recommendation

*-- **That each year, the budget of this province reflect the funding requirements to meet the mandate of Bill 85.***

The Quality of Education

Responses

The Committee recognizes, through this examination process and their school visits, that integration involves other specialists needed for the delivery of more elaborate and individualized education programs. When a full complement of these human and other resources is available, the quality of our education system should not be diminished but should benefit all students, including those with exceptionalities.

EPILOGUE

This Committee's study into integration provided its members with a window to view the entire public school system and we saw far more than we ever anticipated. Our tour of the schools of this province made it abundantly clear that the system's ability to meet the ever-growing demands placed upon it is being seriously challenged. We cannot continue to patch up or make changes on a number of educational initiatives.

We recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission with a broad mandate to examine our present education system in order to help it prepare for what surely is a new age.

ANNEX

Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick

Seventh Report

of the

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON

SOCIAL POLICY DEVELOPMENT

REPORT ON THE

REVIEW OF SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Special Committee on Social Policy Development

MEMBERSHIP

Mr. Paul Duffie, M.L.A.
Chairman

Dr. Marilyn Trenholme, M.L.A.
Vice-Chairman

Mr. Danny Gay, M.L.A.

Hon. Jane Barry, M.L.A.

Mr. Jean-Paul Savoie, M.L.A.

Dr. Larry Kennedy, M.L.A.

Mr. Paul Kenny, M.L.A.

Mr. Stuart Jamieson, M.L.A.

Dr. Kal Seaman, M.L.A.

Mrs. Ann Breault, M.L.A.

Mr. Reid Hurley, M.L.A.

Mr. Allison DeLong, M.L.A.

Mr. Robert Simpson, M.L.A.

Mr. Bernard Thériault, M.L.A.

Mr. Leo McAdam, M.L.A.

Hon. Edmond Blanchard, M.L.A.

Members of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee on Social Policy Development Responsible for Review on School Integration

Dr. Marilyn Trenholme, Chairperson

Mrs. Ann Breault

Mr. Allison DeLong

Mr. Paul Duffie

Mr. Donald (Danny) Gay

Mr. Reid Hurley

Mr. Paul Kenny

Mr. Jean-Paul Savoie

Dr. Kal Seaman

Mr. Robert Simpson

Mr. Camille Thériault (Substitute)

Mr. Douglas Tyler (Substitute)

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL POLICY DEVELOPMENT ON THE REVIEW OF SCHOOL INTEGRATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

On May 18, 1989 the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick referred to the Special Committee on Social Policy Development the two documents tabled in the House May 11, 1989 entitled "***Report of the Integration Review Committee, English Working Group***" and "***Report of the Francophone Advisory Committee on School Integration***".

The Committee's **Terms of Reference** were as follows:

(1) ***Determine background of integration issues by meeting with Department of Education staff, studying legislation and the purpose of Bill 85, and reviewing research findings.***

(2) ***Investigate integration practices by on-site visitations to schools, teachers and individual classrooms.***

(3) ***Seek public opinion by holding hearings in representative areas of the province, starting in September.***

(4) ***Provide a written report for the Fall sitting of the Legislature, identifying the issues and making recommendations for future directions, changes where necessary and solutions for problems.***

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Your Committee wishes to express its appreciation for the assistance provided by officials in the Department of Education in connection with our briefing session. It also wishes to acknowledge the efficient and dedicated service provided by the staff of the Legislative Assembly, including the Clerk's Office, the Legislative Research Service and the Debates Translation. The Committee is immensely grateful as well to the School Boards, School Principals and Teachers for arranging school visits and providing help with the provincial tour. The cooperation and understanding of all presenters enabled the Committee to fulfil its mandate quickly.

HISTORY OF INTEGRATION IN NEW BRUNSWICK

The public school system in New Brunswick has not always fully recognized the right of all children to education. Prior to 1957 educational services for children with mental handicaps and others with major physical disabilities such as cerebral palsy were the responsibility of their parents and by law local school boards had the right to exclude such students from the public school system.

This situation changed as a result of the Auxiliary Classes Act (1957), which gave the province a responsibility to deliver educational services to students with major disabilities. The actual services would be delivered through sponsoring groups operating under the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded. Because this latter organization was not present throughout New Brunswick, some regions were left without services for these students and as a result, the Auxiliary Classes Act was not a satisfactory solution.

In 1981 the government of the day launched a study of the Auxiliary Classes Act in the hope that all children with special needs could receive educational services. On May 29, 1982 before a meeting of the Canadian Mental Health Association, Premier Richard Hatfield declared that students with mental handicaps and those with special needs had the right to an education. He promised that his government would integrate these children into the regular school system.

From February to April, 1983 the Department of Education sponsored public hearings into the Auxiliary Classes Act and in September, 1983 a recommendation by the Correia-Goguen Report favoured the transfer into the Schools Act of services currently offered by the Auxiliary Classes Act.

In November of 1984 the Department of Social Services announced the closure of the Dr. William F. Roberts School in Saint John, which ceased its operation in December 1985. Children were returned to their home communities, the majority in the greater Saint John area. An effort was made to place these children in supportive educational settings commensurate with their needs and ages. Unfortunately, the rehabilitation services and interdisciplinary teams promised to the schools and communities were not made available to a sufficient degree. However, the savings which resulted from the closure of the Roberts facility were intended to provide funds as well as the initiative for agencies such as the Departments of Health, Social Services and Education to develop shared services.

On June 18, 1986 the Legislature passed Bill 85 amending the Schools Act and repealing the Auxiliary Classes Act. The Schools Act now would be the only law governing programs and services for all pupils **except for students with special education programs under the Education of Aurally or Visually Handicapped Persons Act.** The Advisory Committee to the Minister of Education under the Auxiliary Classes Act would remain intact and was asked to develop a statement of principle on school integration.

Bill 85 provided other legislative changes that are now incorporated in the Schools Act. These include:

1. Section 1.1 defines exceptional pupil as:

   where qualified persons employed by or acting as agents of a school board determine that the behavioural, communicational, intellectual, physical, perceptual or multiple exceptionalities of a person are such that a special education program is considered by them to be necessary for the person, that person shall be an exceptional pupil for the purposes of this Act.

2. Section 1 defines a special education program as:

   ...an education program that is based on the results of continuous assessment and evaluation and which includes a plan containing specific objectives and recommendations for education services that meet the needs of the exceptional pupil.

3. Section 1(e) and 1(f) define school personnel to include:

   1(e) persons other than teachers engaged to deliver or to assist in the delivery of special education programs and services or to assist exceptional pupils,

   1(f) other persons engaged in the areas of attendance, social services, health services, psychology and guidance.

4. Section 1.2 requires a school board to consult with parents during the process of determining exceptionality:

A school board shall ensure that parents are consulted during the process of determination referred to in section 1.1.

5. Section 5(1.1) requires the Minister of Education to provide free school privileges to every person from three to twenty-one years of age inclusive:

Notwithstanding the Age of Majority Act, the Minister shall provide free school privileges to persons from three to twenty-one years of age inclusive who are exceptional pupils receiving special education programs and services that would, before the commencement of this subsection, have been provided under the authority of the Auxiliary Classes Act.

6. Section 5(1.2) makes provision for services, when necessary, to be offered in places other than schools. This provision is not intended as a way of excluding any child from school; however, it does allow the Minister of Education to provide appropriate educational services in a child's home or approved institution in cases where a child may not be able to attend school for medical reasons, or needs extensive specialist intervention that cannot be offered effectively by schools:

Where an exceptional pupil is not able to receive a special education program or service in a school under subsection (1.1), the Minister may provide the program or service in the pupil's home or in an institution approved by the Minister.

7. Section 6 extends the Minister's authority to prescribe or approve: curriculum; evaluation procedures; pilot, experimental and summer courses; and materials and apparatus to ensure that it covers special education programs and services:

(a) may prescribe or approve

(i) instructional organization, programs, services and courses, including special education programs and services, for all school districts,

(ii) evaluation procedures for instructional organization, programs, services and courses, including special education programs and services, prescribed or approved under subparagraph (i), and

(iii) for any school district pilot, experimental and summer school programs, services and courses, including special education programs and services;

(b) may prescribe or approve instructional and other materials and apparatus for use in the schools or for use in special education programs and services; and

(c) may approve or recommend books for school libraries.

8. Section 9(4.1) provides for the funding of special education programs and services:

The budget provided under subsection (4) shall include provision for special education programs and services.

9. Section 45(2.1) provides for the placement of all students in the regular class and considers that every child should succeed there unless such a placement proves detrimental to the needs of the child or other children. This provision states:

A school board shall place exceptional pupils such that they receive special education programs and services in circumstances where exceptional pupils can participate with pupils who are not exceptional pupils within regular classroom settings to the extent that is considered practicable by the Board having due regard for the educational needs of all pupils.

10. Section 45(2.2) states that the Minister may issue guidelines to school boards:

The Minister may issue guidelines to school boards for the placement of exceptional pupils in accordance with subsection (2.1).

A statement of principle namely ***"l'Énoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire"*** was published in January of 1988 by the Francophone sector of the Department of Education. The English sector of the Department published the ***"Working Guidelines on Integration"*** in March of 1988.

In the summer of 1988 the Minister of Education established an Advisory Committee for the implementation of school integration. This committee was later divided into Francophone and English sub-committees, reporting to the Minister in February, 1989.

The major recommendations of the Francophone Advisory Committee on School Integration are annexed hereto as Appendix "A" and the Integration Review Committee (English working group) as Appendix "B".

Because of the great concerns expressed by both parents and teachers as well as other interested groups regarding the implementation of integration, the New Brunswick Legislature on May 11, 1989 referred the reports of the Integration Review Committee and of the Francophone Advisory Committee on School Integration to the Special Committee on Social Policy Development for consideration and public input.

THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee had an initial session with the two Deputy Ministers and support staff of the Department of Education on June 6, 1989 to become familiar with the Departmental initiatives concerning the implementation of Bill 85.

School visits followed in various areas of the province (Appendix C). Throughout September and October, 1989, public hearings were held and more schools were visited. In excess of 250 briefs were submitted. Hearings took place in seven locations in New Brunswick: Fredericton, Bathurst, Newcastle, Saint John, Moncton, Grand Falls and Woodstock.

Due to the overwhelming response, the variety of complex issues raised, as well as the short and long-term implications for New Brunswick's educational system and society, the Committee felt obligated to review in more detail and study in greater depth its findings before submitting a final report. However, the Committee felt compelled to present several recommendations in its interim report since a number of issues identified during the hearings demand immediate attention.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In view of the overwhelming province-wide support for the concept of integration, the Committee recommends:

> ***that the Government of New Brunswick reaffirm its commitment to Bill 85, without any change in the Schools Act at this time, and furthermore that the students identified in the said Act (Section 1.1) be provided with appropriate educational services throughout New Brunswick.***

2. Because discrepancies in the interpretation and implementation of Bill 85 were evident during the public hearings, the Committee recommends:

> ***that the Minister of Education reconcile the differences in the interpretation and implementation of Bill 85 and provide strong and clear directives to all School Boards regarding the processes required to fulfil the spirit and intent of the said Bill; and furthermore that the Minister review and bring into effect modifications or revisions in the guidelines and/or statement(s) of principles to interpret Bill 85 consistently to ensure the rights to education for all children in New Brunswick.***

3. In response to the universal call for increased funding for integration, the Committee recommends:

> ***that the Minister of Education immediately address the financial needs of individual Boards to meet the requirements of implementing Bill 85. The Committee's final report will contain a number of additional recommendations with financial implications.***

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In view of the overwhelming province-wide support for the concept of integration, the Committee recommends:

> ***that the Government of New Brunswick reaffirm its commitment to Bill 85, without any change in the Schools Act at this time, and furthermore that the students identified in the said Act (Section 1.1) be provided with appropriate educational services throughout New Brunswick.***

2. Because discrepancies in the interpretation and implementation of Bill 85 were evident during the public hearings, the Committee recommends:

> ***that the Minister of Education reconcile the differences in the interpretation and implementation of Bill 85 and provide strong and clear directives to all School Boards regarding the processes required to fulfil the spirit and intent of the said Bill; and furthermore that the Minister review and bring into effect modifications or revisions in the guidelines and/or statement(s) of principles to interpret Bill 85 consistently to ensure the rights to education for all children in New Brunswick.***

3. In response to the universal call for increased funding for integration, the Committee recommends:

> ***that the Minister of Education immediately address the financial needs of individual Boards to meet the requirements of implementing Bill 85. The Committee's final report will contain a number of additional recommendations with financial implications.***

4. Throughout the hearings, the Committee heard repeatedly of the need for additional training for teachers, both pre-service and in-service, to meet the challenges of integration. The Committee recommends:

> ***that the Minister of Education consult immediately with the Minister of Advanced Education and Training and the institutions of post-secondary education in New Brunswick to improve their programs to enable them to better prepare teachers for the education of exceptional students. Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the Minister of Education address the need for increased professional development for teachers through in-service programs, and primarily at the local level.***

5. In the course of the public hearings and the school visits, the Committee became aware of the existence in New Brunswick of fears and misconception concerning integration. Therefore the Committee recommends:

> ***that the Minister of Education provide strong leadership towards the full implementation of Bill 85 in every District by promoting the positive aspects of integration, the successes of the process and the expectations for the future good of all students and of society in general.***

CONCLUSION

The provincial tour and the public hearings during which more than 250 briefs (Appendix D) were received, provided the Committee with several major insights into the process of integration in the schools of New Brunswick. The Committee found that Bill 85 has created a fundamental change in the educational system of New Brunswick.

What is most exciting and most promising for the future education of all children of New Brunswick are the remarkable achievements with integration. These successes are a reflection of the determination of educators at all levels to provide each child with an opportunity to learn to his/her fullest potential.

The Committee, however, came to realize that the system was not adequately prepared for these giant steps in integration.

The precipitous implementation of this process in 1987 raised high hopes for parents and children without providing adequate planning, funding, resources, training and staff. Different School Boards have coped with this dilemma at different speeds and with different approaches. Not all children have had an equal opportunity to become integrated and not all teachers have received adequate support. As a consequence, many parents and teachers have become frustrated. Parents are demanding more integration. Parents, Boards and Teachers are demanding more help and reduced class size. A very stressful situation has developed in many instances.

The Committee was impressed by the level of goodwill found among the presenters. The Committee believes that the problems which exist can be solved when there is the will on the part of everyone concerned, including government, to overcome these obstacles.

The Committee accepts as its mandate to study all of the briefs submitted and to review the literature on this subject in its preparation of a final report for the third session of the 51st Legislature. The Committee is confident that the recommendations which will come forth will contribute to the progress of integration and will chart a course to put this process on a more secure basis.

The Committee will be recommending that the Government undertake major initiatives to ensure the education system in New Brunswick becomes a true reflection of social justice and individual rights for every child. These initiatives should guarantee for every child a quality education which will usher New Brunswick youth into the twenty-first century with the ability to compete and to take their place proudly across Canada and around the world.

And the Committee begs leave to make a further report.

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDATIONS

General Comments:

1. That the Department of Education use the term "***élèves en difficulté d'apprentissage ou d'adaptation***" rather than "***élèves exceptionnels***" and that this term be the one used in official Department of Education documents.

2. That, during the revision of the Schools Act, the term "***élèves exceptionnels***" be replaced by "***élèves en difficulté d'apprentissage ou d'adaptation***".

3. That the Department of Education replace the term "***normalisant***" by "***le moins restreignant***".

4. That tables on the screening procedures, identification of pupils, appeal process, role of the parents, and training of non-teaching professionals in the school environment be added to the Énoncé de principe during its revision.

Définition of School Integration:

5. That, during the revision of the Énoncé de principe, the definition of integration be changed as follows: replace the word "***normalisant***" by "***le moins restreignant***", place "***plan éducatif individualisé***" in parentheses, and add "***programme d'adaptation scolaire***", so as to read "***programme d'adaptation scolaire (plan éducatif individualisé)***".

Clientele:

6. That the Department of Education clarify the dfinition of an exceptional pupil (pupil with learning or adjustment difficulties) and ensure that the identification of the different types of pupils with learning or adjustment difficulties is based on universally recognized criteria.

7. That the Department of Education, in conjunction with the Department of Health and Community Services, establish a screening mechanism for children with learning or adjustment difficulties, from birth through school admission.

8. That the Department of Education specify and define the services for so-called gifted pupils and that this clientele be identified on the basis of universally recognized criteria.

Educational Options:

9. That, during the revision of the Énoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire, the text presenting the educational options be rewritten in order to demonstrate that options 1 to 3 are the preferred options and to encourage the school board staff to promote the placement of pupils with serious learning or adjustment difficulties in regular classes, while making sure that their needs are met.

10. That the educational options be approved as presdented in order to provide the school boards with an organizational model for meeting the needs of exceptional pupils.

Conditions:

Heightening Awareness of the Parties Concerned

11. That the Department of Education develop awareness program to meet the needs of the different groups.

12. That the Department of Education initiate a special awareness campaign.

13. That the Department of Education place the emphasis on heightening public awareness.

Teacher Training

14. That the Department of Education develop a professional development program for teachers, emphasizing attitudes, approaches, and techniques, and that the program be designed for all professionals in the school environment.

15. That professional development for teachers be provided at the school district level, and preferably at the school level.

16. That, during revision of the Énoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire, the title of Table 2, Formation des enseignantes et enseignants (Teacher Training) be replaced by Formation continue des enseignantes et enseignants (Continuing Teacher Training).

Initial Teacher Training

17. That the joint committee involving the Department of Education and the Faculty of Education at the Centre universitaire de Moncton study the complementary initial training needs with regard to integration and determine the minimal skills which the teachers should acquire.

18. That, taking school integration into account, the Department of Education, through the Minister's Advisory Committee on Teacher Licensing and Certification, revise the minimum requirements for obtaining a Bachelor of Education degree.

Individualized Educational Plan

19. That the Departmnt of Education provide the human resources required to ensure the development and implementation of individualized educational plans for pupils with serious learning or adjustment difficulties, and offer the necessary professional development.

Support Services

20. That, during revision of the Énoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire, the table entitled ***"services de soutien"*** (Support Services) be divided into two tables, one on human resources and the other on physical and material resources.

21. That the roles of the school-based team and the school board team be explained and their composition and responsibilities established.

22. That the Department of Education provide the school boards with the necessary human and material resources to facilitate the planning and implementation of integration.

23. That the Department of Education specify the tasks of classroom attendants and teacher aides and provide them with training.

24. That the Department of Education ensure, through memoranda of understanding, that interdepartmental services are available in the school environment.

25. That the Department of Education, in cooperation with the Departments concerned, ensure that support services are available outside the school context for pupils between the ages of 18 and 21 who have serious learning and adjustment difficulties, when it is determined through a case study that the school is not the most appropriate environment for meeting the needs.

Planning of Integration by School Board

26. That the Department of Education prepare an administrative guide on school integration for school boards and their staffs, containing the legal foundations, roles of the parties concerned, basic services, guidelines for preschool services, etc.

27. That the planning and implementation of school integration be spread over a maximum period of three years (1989-1992).

28. That the Department of Education study the concept of weighting factors with regard to the number of pupils per class and preparation periods for teachers who have pupils with serious learning and adjustment difficulties in their class.

29. That the Department of Education prepare a guide describing its responsibilities with regard to school integration.

30. That the Department of Education provide remedial educational services for students with mild and moderate learning or adjustment difficulties.

Funding

31. That the Department of Education provide the school boards with the funding required for services for gifted pupils and for the planning and implementation of integration, and that such funding be separate from the budget provided for regular education.

32. That the Department of Education develop a funding formula for special education services which takes the notion of equity into account, and that the 1:500 ratio be maintained for the other pupils requiring remedial educational services.

33. That the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Community Services cooperate in the funding of interdepartmental services.

TOWARDS A REVISED AND CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS ACT

34. That the Department of Education, in its revision of the Schools Act, make provision for aurally and visually handicapped pupils, so that there will be only one Schools Act in New Brunswick.

Appeal Process:

35. That the Department of Education, in cooperation with the organizations concerned, define and implement an appeal process with regard to decisions affecting the lives and development of pupils in the school environment, and that this procedure be included in the revised Schools Act.

Role of Parents/Guardians:

36. That the Department of Education define the role of parents in the school environment and that these provisions be included in the revised Schools Act.

37. That the Department of Education develop a guide on the role of parents in the school environment for parents and school board administrators.

Access to Pupil Records:

38. That the Department of Education stipulate, in the revised Schools Act, the right to information, favoring the concept of informed access to records.

Age of Access to Educational Services and Services for Preschoolers:

39. That the Department of Education, in cooperation with the Department of Health and Community Services, offer educational services to all children with learning or adjustment difficulties from birth through the age of 21, as stipulated in the Education of Aurally of Visually Handicapped Persons Act.

40. That the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Community Services see that a mechanism is developed to ensure equity in the current preschool services.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

41. That, before the end of June 1989, the Francophone Sector of the Department of Education revise the Énoncé de principe sur l'intégration scolaire with a view to including the changes proposed by the Committee.

42. That the Francophone Sector and the Department of Education continue implementing school integration in accordance with the approach recommended in the revised version.

APPENDIX B

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the faculties of education in New Brunswick universities undertake to consider throughout the curriculum the challenges of teaching students with a wide range of abilities within the regular classroom.

2. That the faculties of education themselves undertake whatever professional development activities are necessary to meet the challenges of preparing teachers for integrated classrooms.

3. That the Minister of Education form a working group to identify needs and plan a specific strategy to implement adequate in-service programs at the provincial and school district levels. The working group should be composed of representatives of teachers, universities, and school district and Department of Education officials, and should have input from parents and interested organizations.

4. That school district be allocated supply teacher funds in order to provide release time for planning and consultation.

5. That the teacher aide classification be expanded to allow for the employment of persons with specialized training and/or skills.

6. That school districts be required to provide training for all paraprofessional staff prior to their assuming duties with the students, and that funds be made available to make this possible.

7. That additional designated funds be allocated to enable school boards to provide free school privileges in individual or integrated settings to preschoolers who are exceptional pupils as specified under section 5(1.1) of the Schools Act.

8. That the Minister of Education appoint a working group to study section 5(1.1) of the Schools Act with a view to recommending ways to support all preschool exceptional pupils who need services.

9. That consultation be undertaken with the Departments of Health and Community Services, Advanced Education and Training, Labour, Income Assistance and other appropriate agencies concerning the transition of exceptional students from the school system to the community.

10. That the Department of Education adopt the 1986 document ***"Barrier Free Access": Public School Considerations*** as an operational policy to deal with new construction and/or renovations to school buildings for the purpose of guaranteeing barrier-free access.

11. That the working guidelines of integration state more clearly that they do at present the responsibility for school boards and schools to make every effort to facilitate the meaningful participation of parents in their children's education.

13. That in any meeting concerning their child -- parent-teacher conference, case conference or an appeal situation -- the parent be advised that he or she has the right to bring along another person for support. Both teachers and parents should be made aware in advance of who will attend the meeting.

14. That issues concerning parent involvement: case conferences, parent interviews, and the advocacy role of parents, be thoroughly addressed within the context of regular in-service sessions for teachers.

15. That school districts assume responsibility to involve parents in the development of their child's individual education plan.

16. That the Minister establish a just appeal procedure, based on recommendations from a broadly representative group, for cases where parents do not agree with identification, placement or other decisions affecting their children.

17. That the Minister of Education review the matter of parent participation and take appropriate steps to insure that parents' rights are identified.

18. That guidelines be written concerning the collaborative development and implementation of individual education plans.

19. The New Brunswick Government has shown leadership in its commitment to integration. The principle is now established and the willingness and motivation to implement it fully are there. However, this Committee advises the Minister that the budget for meeting students' special needs has not been adequate to allow school boards to deliver the services mandated by legislation.

20. Given that the number of exceptional pupils has increased and therefore the need for support has also increased, it is recommended that for the school year 1989-90 the per pupil supplement provided by the Department of Education to school districts for special education be increased by thirty-seven dollars to $260 per pupil (total population).

21. That the Minister of Education be advised that this Committee supports in principle the resolution at the 1988 annual meeting of the New Brunswick School Trustees' Association to the effect that school district budget must be increased each year until New Brunswick reaches the national level of funding.

22. That an external study of school district funding including special education allocations be commissioned by the Minister of Education to begin immediately so that recommendations can be available prior to the 1990-91 budget.

23. The Committee advises the Minister that school districts cannot provide adequate and appropriate educational services to many exceptional students without support, services and expertise in the areas of speech/language pathology, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, psychology and psychiatry. These professionals are currently not available in required numbers in the province. It is imperative that the Government address this issue.

24. That the Department of Education and/or School Districts be authorized to employ professional support staff where required and that additional funding be provided for this purpose.

25. That the Minister of Education direct officials of the Department of Education to continue the work of revising the 1988 Guidelines on Integration to reflect the recommendations of this Committee.

APPENDIX C

SCHOOLS VISITED

Central Carleton Elementary School	
Hartland High School	Hartland
Woodstock High School	Woodstock
St. Stephen Elementary School	St. Stephen
St. Stephen Middle School	St. Stephen
St. Stephen High School	St. Stephen
St. George Fundy High School	St. George
St. George Elementary School	St. George
St. George Junior High School	St. George
Back Bay Elementary School	Back Bay
Mgr. Gallien	Néguac
La Source	Sheila
La Vague	Le Goulet
L'école élémentaire	Shippagan
Ste. Famille	Bathurst
Le Tournesol	Petit Rocher
Bathurst High School	Bathurst
J. G. Chalmers Jr High	Bathurst
Centre Scolaire Carrefour Beausoleil	Newcastle
Upper Miramichi Regional High	Boiestown
Boiestown Elementary School	Boiestown
Harkins elementary School	Newcastle
Harkins Junior High School	Newcastle
Miramichi Valley High School	Newcastle
Apollo	Campbellton
L'école élémentaire	Kedgwick
L'école élémentaire	St. Quentin
Thomas Albert	Grand Falls
Sacré Coeur	Grand Falls
Beaverbrook	Moncton
Harrison Trimble High	Moncton
Lion Don Steeves	Moncton
Queen Elizabeth	Moncton
Claud D. Taylor	Riverview
Riverview High School	Riverview
Fredericton High School	Fredericton
Stanley High School	Stanley
Stanley Elementary School	Stanley
Bayview Elementary School	Saint John
Prince Charles School	Saint John
Millidgeville North School	Millidgeville
Kennebecasis Valley High School	Quispamsis - Rothesay

Lakefield Elementary School	Rothesay
Quispamsis Junior High School	Quispamsis
Rothesay Elementary School	Rothesay
Harry Miller Junior High School	Rothesay
Quispamsis Elementary School	Quispamsis
Nackawic High Scool	Nackawic
Nackawic Elementary School	Nackawic
Royal Road Elementary	Fredericton
Albert Street Junior High School	Fredericton
South Devon Elementary School	Fredericton
Centennial Elementary School	Woodstock
Woodstock Junior High	Woodstock
Salem Elementary School	Sackville
Marshview Middle School	Dorchester
Dorchester Consolidated School	Dorchester
Tantramar Regional High	Sackville
Port Elgin Junior High	Port Elgin
Port Elgin Elementary School	Port Elgin
Edith Cavell School	Moncton
Sunny Brae School	Moncton
Lewisville Junior High School	Moncton

APPENDIX D

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED WITH RESPECT TO SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Susan Adams
Association des enseignants et enseignantes francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick
Association for Exceptional Children
Boards of School Trustees of Districts 26 and 27
Heather Burke-Clarke
Rowena Cantfell
Connie Dunham
Faculty of Education, UNB
Learning Disabilities Association of New Brunswick
Faith Mowatt
New Brunswick Medical Society
New Brunswick Teachers' Association
Ronald Porter
Harry Rigby
Alene Steinbach
Student Services Branch - Department of Education
Supervisors for Shared Services for Central New Brunswick
Youth Council of New Brunswick
Nancy Amos
Carolyn Barton
Board of School Trustees - District 24
Board of School Trsutees - District 25
Lois Carson
Canadian Deaf-Blind and Rubella Association
Canadian National Institute for the Blind
Fredericton Association for Community Living
Gerry Hill
Mr. and Mrs. Leslie Jackson
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Leavitt
New Brunswick Association for Community Living
New Brunswick Child Welfare Association Inc.
New Brunswick School Superintendents' Association
New Brunswick School Supervisors Organization
Mr. and Mrs. Peter Penner
Preschool Centre
Joy Walters
Gail Weinsieder
Canadian Union of Public Employees - Local 2745
Early Intervention Parents Group
Wyn Everett
Anna Hillman
Janice Legere

New Brunswick Association of Social Workers
New Brunswick School Trustees' Association
UNB Learning Centre - Faculty of Education
Association des conseillers scolaire francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick
Association des enseignantes et enseignants francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick - Cercle 6
Association des enseignantes et enseignants francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick - Cercle 7
Association des enseignantes et enseignants francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick - Cercle 37
Association des enseignantes et enseignants francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick - Cercle 41
Association pour l'intégration communautaire de Tracadie
Bathurst Association for Community Living
Board of School Trustees - District 42
Canadian Physiotherapy Association - New Brunswick Branch
Dianne Chamberlain
Comité des parents de l'école Sainte-Famille
Directeur de l'école Sainte-Famille
District scolaire 37
Anne Gamache
Anne-Marie Gauthier
Claudia Godin
Roland Godin
Le Conseil du district 42 des Comités de parents du Nouveau-Brunswick Inc.
Diane Levesque
Parent Resources for the Young Disabled
Personnel enseignant - École Sainte-Famille
Mr. and Mrs. Jean-Paul Arseneau
Board of School Trustees - District 36
Mr. and Mrs. Donald Comeau
Conseil scolaire 37
Epilepsy New Brunswick - Restigouche Chapter
New Brunswick Teachers' Association - District 42
Sugarloaf Senior High School
Bertha Arseneau
Board of School Trustees - District 10
Board of School Trustees - District 40
Canadian Association fof Community Living - Miramichi Branch
Groupe de parents d'enfants exceptionnels de Rogersville
Jackie Jardine
Mark King
Herman Koops
Eleanor McLaughlin
Evelyn Mills (on behalf of Roxanne Smith)
New Brunswick Learning Disabilities Association - Miramichi Chapter
New Brunswick Substitute Teachers' Association
New Brunswick Teachers' Association - District 6

F. A. Plaxton
Mary Rawlinson
Rexton Association for Community Living
Eileen Saunders
School District 8
Mrs. Raymond Vautour
Board of School Trustees - District 19
Canadian Association for Community Living - St. Stephen Branch
Robert Cotterill
Early Intervention Program
David Jory
Learning Disabilities Association of New Brunswick - Sussex Chapter
Gillian Pipes
Superintendent of Schools - District 19
Supervisor of Schools - District 21
Board of School Trustees - District 30
Canadian Association for Community Living - Rothesay Division
Elaine Cox
Pauline Crealock
Fundy Regional Council Association for Community Living
Marie, Jim and Kevin Gerrior
Glen Falls School
Cathy Gould
Joan Jones
Mrs. Edward Kennedy
Learning Disabilities Association of New Brunswick - Saint John Chapter
Nancy Marsden
Carolyn Messer
New Brunswick Association for Independent Living
New Brunswick Teachers' Association - District 19
Saint John Association for Community Living
School District 22 and 23
Sussex Association for Community Living
Vocational Training Centre
Board of School Trustees - District 18
CASE 19 (Construction and School Education - District 19)
Mr. and Mrs. James Eagles
Liz Flogeras
Home and School Association - Lakefield Elementary School
Janice Levy
Beverley Lindsay
Kathy Mallory
New Brunswick Association of Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists
Mr. and Mrs. John Rodger
J. A. Régis Vautour
Barbara Barnett
Cercle 12 de l'AEFNB
Cercle de FENB

Cercle 13 de M de l'AEFNB
Cercle 39 de l'AEFNB
District scolaire 12
District scolaire 39
Faculté des sciences de l'éducation de l'Université de Moncton
Greater Moncton Association for Community Living
Integration Committee - Board of School Trustees - District 15
Darlene Keirstead
Learning Disabilities Associations - Moncton
Guy LeBlanc
Jane Lennox
Lewisville Junior High School
Rose McClellan
Léonel Méthot
New Brunswick Federation of Home and School Association
New Brunswick Teachers' Association - Branch 40
Nurses Association of New Brunswick
Libby Allman
Mr. and Mrs. Jean Belliveau
District scolaire 13
Chapître Beauséjour du Conseil pour les enfants exceptionnels
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Burgess
Mrs. Pat DuLong
Loney Hudson
Le Comité de parents du Nouveau-Brunswick Inc.
Betsy Legault
New Brunswick Teachers' Association - District 15
New Brunswick Teachers' Association - District 18
Premier's Council on the Status of Disabled Persons
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Robichaud
Mr. and Mrs. Preston Smith
Sussex Early Intervention Program
Mr. and Mrs. Bevan Trites
Tobique Valley High School
Rita Vallilée
Board of School Trustees - School District 54
Cité des Jeunes, Edmundston
Association des enseignants francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick - Cercle 33
Association des enseignants francophones du Nouveau-Brunswick - Cercle 32
District scolaire 33
District scolaire 32
Rina Dalpé (Comité de parents)
L'Association de Grand-Sault pour l'intégration communautaire
Board of School Trustees - Districts 30 and 31
Board of School Trustees - District 29
Board of School Trustees - District 28
Community Industries Employment Vocational Association
Carleton-Victoria Child Development Services, Inc.

New Brunswick Teachers' Association - District 29
Wendy Dickinson
Mr. and Mrs. Ken Nichols
Woodstock Association for Community Living
Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Thompson
Northern Carleton Association for Community Living
Community Residential Living Board
Speech-Language Pathologists - Districts 28 and 29
Superintendent of School Districts 28 and 29
Student Services Coordinator - Districts 28 and 29
Association for Community Living
Pam Priesen - Alberta Association for Community Living
Marsha Forest - Centre for Integrated Education and Community
Donald P. Barnes - Newfoundland Association for Community Living
Orville R. Endicott - Ontario Association for Community Living
Nerida Robson - Association for Community Living - Manitoba
Paul Dorval - Gateway Association for the Mentally Handicapped
Canadian Association for Community Living - Datmouth, Nova Scotia
Canadian Association for Community Living - Downsview, Ontario
Gateway Association for the Mentally Handicapped
Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Burke
Louise Lavalle
Hazel Noel
Hermina Landry - Comité sur l'intégration scolaire
New Brunswick School Supervisors' Organization
Mr. and Mrs. David Morgan
School District 9
Mount Allison University
Sandra Stephens
Jane Boyd
Jill Carson
Ellen Waye
Heather Zinck
Lucille Bastarache
Elaine Maloney
J. B. Zinck
APSEA Itinerant for the Visually Impaired
Eva Hachey
Roy Watson, Dawn Dunfield and Heather Smith
Margaret Trahms
Judy Nutter
People Care Inc.
Sylvia J. Peters
Nancy Rearick
Sue Richards
Dawn DeCourcey and Carol Anne Daigle
Kenneth Mott and Hattie Mott
Jean H. Godin

Mrs. G. R. Higgins
Wanda Robertson
Margaret Martin
Reginald Plantain
Mr. and Mrs. Phil Atkinson
Marie McKay
M. et Mme. Jacques Sirois
Karla Hudson
Connie Fraser
Gail Lawrence
Barbara Everett
Mr. and Mrs. Russell W. Theriault
Mr. and Mrs. Harvie Hamilton
Alfred Smith
New Brunswick Association of Occupational Therapists
Gracie Mersereau
John Nisbet
Opal III - Fredericton Respite Services Inc.
Parents of School District 26
David C. Meek
Lena Barua
Karen Dempsey
Multicultural Association of Fredericton Inc.
Patrick Ouellet
Conseil Scolaire 51
Mr. and Mrs. Jack Passmore
Mr. and Mrs. Daniel LeBlanc
Colette Chiasson
M. et Mme. Guy Parent
Margaret Clark
Lynn Levesque
Betty K. Noble
Gerald Rodney
Mr. and Mrs. Dale Isherwood
Carol Alward
Mr. and Mrs. Camille Boucher
Nancy MacDonald
Carolyn Howroyd
Dellis Belliveau
Moncton Community Residences Inc.
Peter Townsend
Ella Larsson
Donna Bustard
Mr. and Mrs. Edmond Therrien
Gloria Logan
Anita Corbett
Mr. and Mrs. Marven Grant

Robert A. Gaudet
Mrs. Ken Harper
Mrs. Terry Wilkins
Mr. and Mrs. Chambers
Christine Sanford
Danya Lymburner
Les Parents de l'association pour l'intégration communautaire de St. Louis et la région
Serge Lemieux
Mr. and Mrs. Larry Lewis
Robéa Cormier
Donna Murray
Anne Lemieux
Rosslyn Hansen
Lise Santerre
Mr. and Mrs. Christian Dupéré
Mr. and Mrs. Claude Boudreau
Mr. and Mrs. Raoul Durette